



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,586	11/13/2003	Sanjay Bakshi	5038-332	1998
32231 7590 03/17/2010 MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C. - Intel 210 SW MORRISON STREET, SUITE 400 PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER BOKHARI, SYED M				
ART UNIT 2473		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/17/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@techlaw.com

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/713,586

Applicant(s)

BAKSHI ET AL.

Examiner

SYED BOKHARI

Art Unit

2473

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-22, 24, 25 and 27-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15, 17-22, 24, 25 and 27-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant amendment filed on September 24th, 2009 has been entered. Claim 18 has been amended. Claims 1-15, 17-22, 24-25 and 27-34 are still pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1-14, 17, 25 and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shenoy et al. (US 2003/0223425 A1) in view of Hartmann et al. (US 5,936,957) and further in view of Moberg et al. (USP 6,697,872).

Shenoy et al. discloses a communication system for distributed implementation of control protocols in routers and switches with the following features: regarding claim 1, a system, comprising a control card, comprising (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "network node includes a control module 106" recited in paragraph 0016 lines 3-4), a control processor to execute a control portion of an exterior gateway protocol (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module 106 and 108 include a processor 122 to carry out the function" recited in paragraph 0018 lines 1-3), a routing table of exterior gateway routes and devices (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "updating forwarding information, programming hardware tables" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 4-9), a line card, comprising (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "three line cards 102A, 102B and 102C" recited in paragraph 0016 lines 5-6), a line processor to execute an offload portion of an exterior

gateway protocol (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "line processor 118 performs functions" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 10-12) and a communications port to allow termination of at least one communication link (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "each line card includes at least one port to allow link termination" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 1-6); regarding claim 3, the control processor further comprising an Intel Architecture processor (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "processor within each control module includes Intel1386 processor family" recited in paragraph 0018 lines 1-5); regarding claim 5, the line processor further comprising an Intel IXP processor (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "processor within each control module includes Intel1386 processor family" recited in paragraph 0018 lines 1-5); regarding claim 8, a method of processing an exterior gateway protocol packet (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "protocols are implemented by control module" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16), receiving an incoming packet at a line-card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "line cards receive the traffic" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 1-4), Parsing the packet to extract protocol data (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "packet parsing" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 10-12); transmitting any control-relevant data to a control card (Fig.3 line card operating system, see "forwarding information to control module" recited in paragraph 0035 lines 1-7) and generating message traffic for peer gateways including announcing routes to the peer gateways (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "forwarding information is generated" recited in paragraph 0022 lines 1-9); regarding claim 9, receiving the incoming packet at the line-card further comprising receiving a packet

through the Transmission Control Protocol (Fig.2, two communication channel used to communicate information, see "uses reliable transport layer protocol TCP" recited in paragraph 0028 lines 3-7); regarding claim 13, transmitting any control-relevant data to a control card (Fig. 2, router implementing a distributed control protocol, see "line card operating system communicates with control module" recited in paragraph 0027 lines 1-8) and further comprising transmitting data related to valid updates from the peer gateways (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "protocols are implemented by control module" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16); regarding claim 25, a method of establishing a control portion of a distributed exterior gateway protocol (Fig.4, flow diagram of a process for implementing the distributed, see "perform the offload portion of the of the distributed control protocol" recited in paragraph 0032 lines 10-17), executing offload portions of the protocol (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module 106 and 108 include a processor 122 to carry out the function" recited in paragraph 0018 lines 1-3) setting up control connections with line-cards (Fig. 2, router implementing a distributed control protocol, see "TCP includes set up control" recited in paragraph 0028 lines 5-7), configuring the line cards (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implement configuration commands" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 1-6) and performing central Border Gateway Protocol functions (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implements border gateway protocol BGP" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16); regarding claim 27, registering a control portion of a protocol to be executed further comprising registering the control portion with a distributed control plane architecture infrastructure module

(Fig.3, depicts a system for distributing forwarding information through a user space and kernel space, see "distribution engine manages the distribution of forwarding information at kernel space level" recited in paragraph 0032 lines 4-15); Regarding claim 28, performing central Border Gateway Protocol functions further comprising processing valid updates from the line cards and adjusting the routing table as needed (Fig.3, depicts a system for distributing forwarding information through a user space and kernel space, see "the forwarding tables in the user space and kernel space are updated" recited in paragraph 0034 lines 20-26); regarding claim 29, performing central Border Gateway Protocol functions further comprising providing an updated routing table to each line card as necessary (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "the distribution of forwarding information between control module and line cards has a distributed processing architecture" recited in paragraph 0031 lines 1-19); regarding claims 30, an article of machine-readable code containing instructions that, when executed, cause the machine to (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "to execute a sequence of machine-readable instructions" recited in paragraph 0046 lines 1-10), receiving an incoming packet at a line-card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "line cards receive the traffic" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 1-4), Parsing the packet to extract protocol data (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "packet parsing" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 10-12) and transmitting any control-relevant data to a control card (Fig.3 line card operating system, see "forwarding information to control module" recited in paragraph 0035 lines 1-7) and generate message traffic for peer gateways including announcing routes to the peer gateways

(Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "forwarding information is generated" recited in paragraph 0022 lines 1-9); regarding claim 31, the instructions causing the machine to receive an incoming packet at a line-card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "line cards receive the traffic" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 1-4), further cause the machine to receive a packet through the Transmission Control Protocol (Fig.2, two communication channel used to communicate information, see "uses reliable transport layer protocol TCP" recited in paragraph 0028 lines 3-7).

Shenoy et al. do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 1, backplane to allow the control card and the line card to communicate and wherein the line card is configured to filter all malformed, illegal and duplicate update messages from peer gateway peers; regarding claim 2, the control processor further comprising a general-purpose processor; regarding claim 4, the line processor further comprising a network-enabled processor; regarding claim 6, the backplane further comprising a physical backplane connection and regarding claim 7, the backplane further comprising a network; regarding claim 8, determining if the packet is valid; regarding claim 10, determining if the packet is valid further comprising determining if the packet is a malformed packet; regarding claim 11, if the packet is valid further comprising applying a packet filter to the packets; regarding claim 12, determining if the packet is valid further comprising applying an address filter to the packets; regarding claim 14, further comprising decrypting encrypted packets; regarding claim 17, generating message traffic for peer gateways further comprising encrypting messages for peer gateways that require encryption; regarding claim 25, initializing a control card, registering a control

portion of a protocol to be executed by the control card with a central registration point and executing offload portions of the protocol; regarding claim 32, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to determine if the packet is a mal-formed packet; regarding claim 33, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply a packet filter to the packet and regarding claim 34, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply an address filter to the packet.

Hartmann et al. disclose a communication system for providing a structure of ATM communication system with the following features: regarding claim 1, backplane to allow the control card and the line card to communicate (Fig. 1, shows the structure of an ATM communication system with a modular structure, see "the communication adapter is formed by a line module, realizing an ATM subscriber connection and an EISA control module realizing an EISA bus connection" recited in column 3 lines 53-60); regarding claim 2, the control processor further comprising a general-purpose processor (Fig. 1, shows the structure of an ATM communication system with a modular structure, see "a personal computer is realized by commercially available personal compute" recited in column 5 lines 33-48); regarding claim 4, the line processor further comprising a network-enabled processor (Fig. 1, shows the structure of an ATM communication system with a modular structure, see "a processor controlled communication" recited in column 2 lines 24-35); regarding claim 6, the backplane further comprising a physical backplane connection (Fig. 1, shows the structure of an

ATM communication system with a modular structure, see "the communication adapter is formed by a line module, realizing an ATM subscriber connection and an EISA control module realizing an EISA bus connection" recited in column 3 lines 53-60) and regarding claim 7, the backplane further comprising a network (Fig. 1, shows the structure of an ATM communication system with a modular structure, see "user network interface" recited in column 4 lines 57-67) and registering a control portion of a protocol to be executed by the control card with a central registration point (Fig.3, flow of a control protocol for distributed implementation of OSPF control protocol, see "offload portion of distributed control protocol is forwarded of the router 12 to control plane" recited in paragraph 0021 lines 1-27).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Shenoy et al. by using the features, as taught by with Hartmann et al., in order to provide backplane to allow the control card and the line card to communicate, the control processor further comprising a general-purpose processor, the line processor further comprising a network-enabled processor, the backplane further comprising a physical backplane connection and the backplane further comprising a network and registering a control portion of a protocol to be executed by the control card with a central registration point. The motivation of using these functionalities is to enhance the functionality of the system in a cost effective manner.

Shenoy et al. and Hartmann et al. do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 1, wherein the line card is configured to filter all malformed, illegal and duplicate update messages from peer gateway peers; regarding claim 8, determining if

the packet is valid; regarding claim 10, determining if the packet is valid further comprising determining if the packet is a malformed packet; regarding claim 11, if the packet is valid further comprising applying a packet filter to the packets; regarding claim 12, determining if the packet is valid further comprising applying an address filter to the packets; regarding claim 14, further comprising decrypting encrypted packets; regarding claim 17, generating message traffic for peer gateways further comprising encrypting messages for peer gateways that require encryption; regarding claim 32, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to determine if the packet is a mal-formed packet; regarding claim 33, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply a packet filter to the packet and regarding claim 34, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply an address filter to the packet.

Moberg et al. discloses a communication system for distributed packet processing using encapsulation and decapsulation chains with the following features: regarding claim 1, wherein the line card is configured to filter all malformed, illegal and duplicate update messages from gateway peers (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the entire packet to verify its validity and determine how to handle" recited in column 4 lines 43-67); regarding claim 8, determining if the packet is valid (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the entire packet to verify its validity" recited in column 4 lines 55-58); regarding claim 10, determining if the packet is valid further comprising applying a packet filter to the packets (Fig.1,

distributed processing architecture, see "examine the entire packet to verify its validity" recited in column 4 lines 55-62); regarding claim 11, if the packet is valid further comprising applying a packet filter to the packets (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "after validation the data packet processed" recited in column 4 lines 47-49); regarding claim 12, determining if the packet is valid further comprising applying an address filter to the packets (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the network address of the received packet" recited in column 4 lines 49-51); regarding claim 14, further comprising decrypting encrypted packets (Fig. 4, chain walker used to process packet, see "decryption element 60" recited in column 7 lines 10-16); regarding claim 17, generating message traffic for peer gateways further comprising encrypting messages for peer gateways that require encryption (Fig. 4, chain walker used to process packet, see "the chain includes an encryption element 74" recited in column 7 lines 10-16 and lines 25-28); regarding claim 25, including providing a routing table and policy data to each line card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the entire packet to verify its validity and determine how to handle" recited in column 4 lines 43-67); regarding claim 32, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to determine if the packet is a mal-formed packet (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the entire packet to verify its validity" recited in column 4 lines 55-62); regarding claim 33, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply a packet filter to the packet (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "after validation the data packet processed" recited in column 4 lines 47-49); regarding

claim 34, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply an address filter to the packet (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the network address of the received packet" recited in column 4 lines 49-51).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Shenoy et al. with Hartmann et al. by using the features, as taught by Moberg et al., in order to provide the line card is configured to filter all malformed, illegal and duplicate update messages from peer gateway peers, determining if the packet is valid, determining if the packet is valid further comprising determining if the packet is a malformed packet, if the packet is valid further comprising applying a packet filter to the packets, determining if the packet is valid further comprising applying an address filter to the packets, decrypting encrypted packets, generating message traffic for peer gateways further comprising encrypting messages for peer gateways that require encryption, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to determine if the packet is a mal-formed packet, the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply a packet filter to the packet and the instructions causing the machine to determine if the packet is valid further causes the machine to apply an address filter to the packet. The motivation of using these functions is to enhance the system in accost effective manner.

6. Claims 18-22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shenoy et al. (US 2003/0223425 A1) in view of Hartmann et al. (US 5,936,957) and further in view of Moberg et al. (USP 6,697,872) and further in view of Ball et al. (US 2005/0074003 A1).

Shenoy et al. disclose the following features: regarding claim 18, a method of establishing an offload portion of a distributed exterior gateway protocol comprising (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "line processor 118 performs functions" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 10-12), registering an offload portion of a protocol to be executed by the line-card with a central registration point (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "line processor 118 performs functions" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 10-12), setup a control connection with a control card (Fig. 2, router implementing a distributed control protocol, see "TCP includes set up control" recited in paragraph 0028 lines 5-7); transmit data resource data to the control card (Fig.3 line card operating system, see "forwarding information to control module" recited in paragraph 0035 lines 1-7); receiving configuration information from the control card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implement configuration commands" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 1-6), performing Border Gateway Protocol functions at the line-card (Fig. 2, router implementing a distributed control protocol, see "TCP includes set up control" recited in paragraph 0028 lines 5-7), and performing central Border Gateway Protocol functions (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implements border gateway protocol BGP" recited in paragraph 0017

lines 9-16) and transmitting only valid Border Gateway Protocol data to the control card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "protocols are implemented by control module" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16); regarding claim 19, registering an offload portion further comprising registering with a distributed control plane architecture infrastructure module (Fig.3, flow of a control protocol for distributed implementation of OSPF control protocol, see "offload portion of distributed control protocol is forwarded of the router 12 to control plane" recited in paragraph 0021 lines 1-27) regarding claim 20, performing Border Gateway Protocol functions (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implements border gateway protocol BGP" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16) and further comprising parsing and validating incoming packets (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "the processor performs packet parsing" recited in paragraph 0020 lines 10-12); regarding claim 22, performing Border Gateway Protocol functions (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implements border gateway protocol BGP" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16) and further comprising caching a routing table received from the control card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "the control module send the forwarding information" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 1-16); regarding claim 24, performing Border Gateway Protocol functions (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "control module implements border gateway protocol BGP" recited in paragraph 0017 lines 9-16);

Moberg et al. disclose the following features: regarding claim 18, initializing a line card (Fig.1, distributed processing architecture, see "building chains on the router

processor and line card upon initialization or configuration change" recited in column 7 lines 60-67 and column 8 lines 1-5); regarding claim 21, performing Border Gateway Protocol functions further comprising filtering all malformed, illegal and duplicate update messages from gateways peers (Fig. 1, distributed processing architecture, see "examine the entire packet to verify its validity and determine how to handle" recited in column 4 lines 43-67) regarding claim 24, further comprising encrypting and decrypting packets as necessary (Fig. 4, chain walker used to process packet, see "decryption element 60" recited in column 7 lines 10-16 and lines 25-28);

Shenoy et al., Hartmann et al. and Moberg et al. do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 18, establishing connections with exterior gateway peers and including running output policies for the each of the gateway peers.

Ball et al. disclose a communications network for implementation of efficient and scaleable routing protocol with the following features: regarding claim 18, establishing connections with exterior gateway peers (Fig. 1, in a schematic block diagram of an inter-domain router, see "establish a logical peer connection" paragraph 0004 lines 1-13 in the background of the invention) and including running output policies for the each of the gateway peers (Fig. 6, an schematic block diagram illustrating the BGP protocol, see "the BGP running inbound policy on all routes" recited in paragraph 0041 lines 1-17).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Shenoy et al. with Hartmann et al. and Moberg et al. by using the features, as taught by Ball et al., in order to provide establishing

connections with exterior gateway peers and including running output policies for the each of the gateway peers. The motivation of using these functions is to enhance the system in a cost effective manner.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shenoy et al. (US 2003/0223425 A1) in view of Hartmann et al. (US 5,936,957) and further in view of Moberg et al. (USP 6,697,872) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Harvey et al. (US 2003/0140167 A1).

Shenoy et al., Hartmann et al. and Moberg et al. disclose the claimed limitations as described in paragraph 5 above. Shenoy et al., Hartmann et al. and Moberg et al. do not disclose the following features: regarding claim 15, generating message traffic for peer gateways and further comprising generating responses required by the incoming packets.

Harvey et al. discloses a method and apparatus for synchronizing redundant communication task with the following features: regarding claim 15, generating message traffic for peer gateways (Fig. 1, flow chart depicting a method for synchronizing TCP tasks, see "an update message should be generated" recited in paragraph 0032 lines 1-11) and further comprising generating responses required by the incoming packets (Fig. 1, flow chart depicting a method for synchronizing TCP tasks, see "issuing TCP packet acknowledgement message step 126" recited in paragraph 0030 lines 1-10).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Shenoy et al. with Hartmann et al. and Moberg et al. by using the features, as taught by Harvey et al., in order to provide of generating message traffic for peer gateways and further comprising generating responses required by the incoming packets. The motivation of using this functionality is to enhance the functionality of the system in a cost effective manner.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed September 24th, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states in the remarks regarding claim 1, "The cited section of Moberg simply states that a line card processor can examine a packet to "verify its validity." However, Moberg does not provide any further explanation of how the validity of a packet is determined. More specifically, Moberg does not teach or suggest that such validity is based on mal-formed, illegal, or duplicate update messages. Furthermore, the cited section of Moberg specifically refers to the processing of data packets and does not teach or suggest any such processing of update messages from gateway peers". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Moberg teaches the claimed limitations "wherein the line card is configured to filter all mal-formed, illegal and duplicate update messages from gateway peers" as recited in column 4 lines 43-67. Moberg describes that the line card processors 24a, 24b perform processing of data packets received at or to be transmitted from the line card. The line card processor 24a receives a packet from interface 25a and examines the entire

packet to verify its validity and determine how to handle certain options provided by the protocol being used to transmit the packet. Examining of the entire packet for the verification of its validity (i.e. soundness or legality or legitimacy or authority etc. – actual meanings of validity) is clear teaching “filter all mal-formed, illegal and duplicate update messages”. Further, the packets are being received or transmit over the network. The figure 1 is only depicting the schematic of a router 20. The figure 2 illustrates two peer routers 20 configured to interconnect two different networks. Routers 20 interconnect a user 30 on one Ethernet local area network (LAN) 32 with a remote server 34 on a different Ethernet LAN 36 with a serial wide area network (WAN) 38 using HDLC (High-level Data Link Control) to connect the two LANs. Applicant states in the remarks regarding claim 8, “Shenoy does not teach or suggest at least “generating message traffic at the line card for peer gateways including announcing routes to the peer gateways” and further “Shenoy actually teaches that forwarding information is generated at either the control card or at the line cards but that such information is only sent to the line cards from the control card and not from a line card to another router. Therefore, Shenoy does not teach this particular feature of the claim, which specifically refers to a line card announcing routes to peer gateways”. Examiner respectfully disagrees, Shenoy teaches the claimed limitations “generating message traffic for peer gateways including announcing routes to the peer gateways” as recited in paragraph 0022 lines 1-9. Shenoy teaches that the forwarding information is generated by the processors (including the line card processors 118 and the control module processor 122) and managed centrally at the primary control module 106. Throughout the

description, forwarding information refers to any data element (i.e., ARP entry, route table entry, etc.) that is used to forward traffic in a network. Therefore, the forwarding information is generated sent from line card to another node or router. Figure 1 clearly illustrates that each of the line cards 102A, 102B, and 102C includes at least one port 116, a processor 118, and memory 120, which perform functions such as receiving traffic into the network node, buffering traffic, storing forwarding information, protocol processing, making forwarding decisions, and transmitting traffic from the network node.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SYED BOKHARI whose telephone number is (571)270-

Art Unit: 2473

3115. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00-17:00 Hrs..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kwang B. Yao can be reached on (571) 272-3182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Syed Bokhari/
Examiner, Art Unit 2473
3/6/2010

/KWANG B. YAO/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2473